UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,288	03/18/2004	Glenn C. Forrester	21986-00001	5657

7590   08/22/2008

John S. Beulick
Armstrong Teasdale LLP
Suite 2600
One Metropolitan Square
St. Louis, MO 63102

EXAMINER
BATURAY, ALICIA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2146	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *05 June 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-25* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This Office Action is in response to the amendment filed 05 June 2008.

2.   Claims 1-25 are pending in this Office Action.

Response to Amendment

3.   Applicant's amendments and arguments with respect to 1-25 filed on 05 June 2008 have

been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of

rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-20 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

anticipated by Stevenson et al. (U.S. 7,257,585) in view of Baird et al. (U.S. 2002/0188603)

and further in view of Skillen et al. (U.S. 6,098,065).

Stevenson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including an embodiment that is

an add-on to a browser allowing the browser to augment files "on the fly," i.e. where the user

directs a browser to a resource located on a network, the method analyzes the file as it is

opened by the browser, augments the file with appropriate hyperlinks, and displays the

augmented file with active hyperlinks. "Clicking on" the hyperlink will redirect the browser

to the associated uniform resource locator (see Summary of Invention).

6.   With respect to claim 2, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a

method further comprising: processing at the client system the at least one of the resulting

web page and other output; and prompting the user to select a command to perform on the

resulting web page (Stevenson, col. 5, lines 60-65).

7.   With respect to claim 3, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a

method wherein selecting an object from an electronic document further comprises selecting

an object including at least one of text, a hyperlink, a picture, a sound file, a video file, and

any selectable object included within the electronic document (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element

133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

8.   With respect to claim 5, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a

method wherein selecting an object from an electronic document further comprises utilizing a

text-grabbing algorithm to select the object (Stevenson, Figs. 4-7; col. 5, lines 8-34).

9.   With respect to claim 6, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a

method for retrieving information using a server system (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col.

4, line 50) coupled to a centralized database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-

47) and at least one client system (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52), said method comprising:

selecting an object from an electronic document displayed on a client system (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches displaying a function menu on the client system to prompt a user to select a desired function; transmitting the selected object and the selected function from the client system to the server system; processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with a target web server to complete the processing of the selected object; and transmitting at least one of a resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 27) and a method wherein displaying a function menu on the client system further comprises enabling the user to designate a web site as a target web site for a function included within the function menu (Baird, page 4, paragraph 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application.

10.   With respect to claim 7, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method for retrieving information using a server system (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50) coupled to a centralized database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47) and at least one client system (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52), said method comprising:

selecting an object from an electronic document displayed on a client system (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches displaying a function menu on the client system to prompt a user to select a desired function; transmitting the selected object and the selected function from the client system to the server system; processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with a target web server to complete the processing of the selected object; and transmitting at least one of a resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 27) and a method wherein displaying a function menu on the client system further comprises enabling the user to customize the function menu by selecting each function included within the function menu (Baird, page 4, paragraph 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application.

11.   With respect to claim 8, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method wherein displaying a function menu on the client system further comprises displaying a function menu on the client system by utilizing at least one of a mouse, a keyboard, a track-ball, a joystick, a digitizing pad, a touch screen, a voice activation device, and any input device connected to the client system (Stevenson, col. 5, lines 51-53).

12.   With respect to claim 9, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method for retrieving information using a server system (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50) coupled to a centralized database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47) and at least one client system (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52), said method comprising: selecting an object from an electronic document displayed on a client system (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches displaying a function menu on the client system to prompt a user to select a desired function; transmitting the selected object and the selected function from the client system to the server system; processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with a target web server to complete the processing of the selected object; and transmitting at least one of a resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 27) and a method wherein processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system further comprises: generating a plurality of universal resource locators (URLs) based on the selected object and the selected function (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with each target web server corresponding to each of the plurality of URLs (Baird, page 2, paragraph 13); generating a processing result at each of the target web servers by processing the selected object (Baird, page 4, paragraph 33); transmitting the results from each of the target web servers to the server system; and processing each of the results at the server system before transmitting at least one resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 4, paragraphs 27 and 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application.

13.   With respect to claim 10, Stevenson teaches a network based system for retrieving information, said system comprising: a client system comprising a user interface and a browser (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52); a centralized database for storing information (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47); and a server system configured to be coupled to said client system and said database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50), said server system further configured to: enable a user to select an object from an electronic document displayed on said user interface (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches display a function menu on said user interface to prompt a user to select a desired function to apply to the selected object; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to produce a processed object (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application.

The combination of Stevenson and Baird does not explicitly teach the use of a server and a web server.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from the server system to a target web server (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a result from the target web server at the server system, the result including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of the result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of the result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Baird in view of Skillen in order to enable the use of a server and a web server. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service.

14.   With respect to claim 14, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 10, including a system wherein said client system further comprises at least one of a cell phone, a computer, a personal digital assistant (PDA), and a television (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52).

15.   Claims 1, 11-13, 16-19, 20, 22-25 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 2, 3, 5-10, 14 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

16.   Claims 4, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over
Stevenson in view of Baird in view of Skillen and further in view of Bates et al. (U.S.
6,735,347).

17.   With respect to claim 4, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a
method for retrieving information using a server system (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col.
4, line 50) coupled to a centralized database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-
47) and at least one client system (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52), said method comprising:
selecting an object from an electronic document displayed on a client system (Stevenson,
Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

        Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

        However, Baird teaches displaying a function menu on the client system to prompt a user
to select a desired function; transmitting the selected object and the selected function from
the client system to the server system; processing the selected object by applying the selected
function at the server system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with a target web
server to complete the processing of the selected object; and transmitting at least one of a
resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 27).

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention
was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the
function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a
search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application.

The combination of Stevenson and Baird does not explicitly teach the use of a server and a web server.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from the server system to a target web server (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a result from the target web server at the server system, the result including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of the result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of the result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Baird in view of Skillen in order to enable the use of a server and a web server. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service.

The combination of Stevenson, Baird and Skillen does not explicitly teach the use of OCR.

However, Bates teaches a method wherein selecting an object from an electronic document further comprises: processing the selected object using optical character recognition (OCR) and extracting text from the selected object using OCR (Bates, col. 5, lines 15-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird and Skillen in view of Bates in

order to enable the use of OCR. One would be motivated to do so in order to convert textual

information contained within an image easily and automatically.

18.   Claims 15 and 21 do not teach or define any new limitations above claim 4 and therefore

are rejected for similar reasons.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at 7:30am - 5pm, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Pwu can be reached on (571) 272-6798. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be

obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alicia Baturay
August 23, 2008

/Jeffrey Pwu/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2146